

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1-6, 12-14 and 17-20 are pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 12 are independent. Claims 5-6 and 12-14 have been withdrawn.

Claim 1 has been amended to correct informalities in claim language and to more clearly define the present subject matter. Claim 20 has been added. Claim 15 has been cancelled without prejudice. Support for the amendment and the new claim is found, for example, at FIGS. 6 and 9 and page 25, lines 13-17 of the specification. Care has been taken to avoid introducing new matter.

Substance of Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for his time and courtesy during an interview conducted with the Applicants' representative, Takashi Saito, on January 12, 2010. During the interview, the Applicants' representative indicated that claim 15 would be cancelled, and claim 17 would be amended or cancelled. The Applicants' representative argued that the alleged first and second intermediate members 5 and 9 of Tamaki do not touch the lower surface of the semiconductor chip 1. Rather, the items 5 and 9 of Tamaki touch the upper surface of the semiconductor chip 1 since the first and second chips 1 and 2 have rear surfaces (i.e., lower surfaces) which adhere to each other by means of an adhesive 15. In response, the Examiner asserted that the surface of chip 1 closest to first base material 19 can be considered the lower surface, which the Applicants' representative disagreed. The Examiner agreed that none of the references discloses that an ohmic electrode is disposed on an entire surface of the lower surface of the semiconductor chip.

Claims Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification allegedly does not reasonably provide enablement for all structures presently known or unknown which perform the claimed functions or operations.

Since claim 15 has been cancelled, the rejection of claim 15 is moot.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment made to claim 17 overcomes this rejection. In this regard, the Examiner's attention is directed to, for example, item D1 shown in FIG. 9 of the present disclosure.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 15 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagisawa (USP Pub. No. 2004/0080028) in view of Tamaki et al. (USP 6,157,080). Claims 1-4, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mamitsu et al. (US 6,703,707) in view of Tamaki. Claim 17 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mamitsu in view of Tamaki, as applied to claim 3, and further in view of Wu et al. (US 6,590,281). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that, as the Examiner conceded in the interview, none of the cited references discloses or suggests that "*an ohmic electrode is disposed on an entire surface of the lower surface of the semiconductor chip,*" as recited by amended claim 1. It should be noted that electrode 11b of Yanagisawa is not disposed on an entire surface of the chip 11. It is clear that Tamaki and Mamitsu fail to disclose an ohmic electrode (item 15 of Tamaki is an adhesive and item 4 of Mamitsu is a bonding member). It is also clear that Wu does not cure the deficiency of Yanagisawa, Mamitsu and Tamaki.

As such, it is clear that none of the cited references discloses or suggests the above identified features of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Thus, it is requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1-4 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

New Claim

Since new claim 20 depends from claim 1 and none of the cited references discloses the subject matter of claim 20, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 is patentable over the cited references.

Conclusion

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP


Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

**Please recognize our Customer No. 53080
as our correspondence address.**

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:TS:MaM
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: January 27, 2010